### Nihilism 1NC

#### Queerness is in structural opposition to the concept of free speech. Queer identity is mocked and bodies are denied lifesaving treatment under the guise of “free speech”. The real question on campus isn’t who can speak, there’s always an alternate forum, but rather who gets the power to *SILENCE* others. Those who champion free speech do so to preserve existing regimes of racialized cisheteropatriarchy.

Boniface 16 [Jonathan. "Freedom of Speech Is No Longer about 'rights', It's about Power." The Queerness. N.p., 7 Mar. 2016. Web.]

A couple of weeks ago, I had the misfortune to attend an event where I saw privilege writ large in all its ugliness. I should perhaps refrain from using the word ‘privilege’ because it tends to make educated white liberals roll their eyes. I should refrain, but I won’t. There are few things more uncomfortable than people oblivious of their privilege, acting in a manner conducive to displaying their obliviousness in its entirety. In fairness, the organisers of the event I attended had their hearts in the right place, having created a system where it was possible to object to actions or words that were tantamount to bullying or which made use of slurs or other oppressive rhetoric. Now, before anyone rolls their eyes into another dimension and talks about the ‘right to be offended’ (**white cis people are a big fan of protecting [the right to be offended]** that right) **this means that I, for example, would be able to object to someone** in the meeting **calling me a ‘faggot’ and that would be upheld as unacceptable,** and I’m down with that. **That said, I don’t think this system went down particularly well with** some other people. Looking across the room, I could see teeth being ground and I could hear more sighing and huffing than Thomas the Tank Engine after smoking a pack of 20 Marlboro Reds. What I’m referring to, of course, are the **white cis heterosexuals**. There’s nothing that warms the cockles of your heart more than hearing a grey haired, educated white man yelling ‘freedom of speech’ in response to someone objecting to oppressive rhetoric. Even more depressing was the fact that this was in an ostensibly ‘liberal’ setting. **Freedom of speech is the big thing right now.** Go on social media and you can read tweet after tweet of **people wringing their hands over the perceived ‘threat’ to free speech, simply because a handful of universities may have told a handful of idiots that their attention-grabbing, divisive and oppressive rhetoric isn’t welcome** in their halls. I mean, **it’s like the whole foundation of civilisation is just unravelling before cis white eyes**. You’ll see more tweets by powerful white cis people objecting to being prevented from offending others than posts lamenting the systematic and institutional discrimination of trans people, or BME people. Unsurprisingly, you could come to the conclusion that **it’s more important to those with power and privilege to protect those who already enjoy power and privilege, than it is to fight against oppression**. And you’d be right. There’s nothing that warms the cockles of your heart more than hearing a grey haired, educated white man yelling ‘freedom of speech’ in response to someone objecting to oppressive rhetoric. In my former life as a teacher of many subjects, including citizenship, one of the big topics of discussion was ‘rights and responsibilities’. If you went through the secondary education system in the UK in the last decade or so, this is probably ringing a few bells. **No, we’re not moving into a situation where people’s right to freedom of speech is under threat; rather we are moving towards an even more dangerous situation where people champion the ‘right’ of freedom of speech above the responsibilities associated with it.** I’m sorry, but no-platforming people like [Germaine Greer](https://thequeerness.com/2015/10/24/no-platforming-the-privileged-is-not-silencing-its-doing-the-right-thing/) or [Julie Bindel](https://thequeerness.com/2016/02/12/sorry-we-cant-ban-everything-that-offends-you-the-julie-bindel-school-of-fighting-the-wrong-fight/) is not more dangerous to our society than absolving people like them of their responsibility for what comes out of their mouths, or from their laptop keyboards. Or, to quote Edina Monsoon, ‘are we in The Others?’ That’s because the argument over **freedom of speech is no longer about ‘rights’.** It’s actually the marker of a quite smug and naïve society to believe that. **We can pat ourselves on the back and talk about ‘equality’ in our society because we have enlightened laws that supposedly uphold it** (I use the term supposedly advisedly as there are many ways in which the law still fails many groups in our society) **but having such legislation does not actually mean that you have created an equal society. Equality is a myth, even in the self-satisfied western world where we think we’ve got it cracked. Yes, those of us in less privileged groups have the right not to be discriminated against in the workplace, or abused in the streets, or passed over for promotion, but that doesn’t mean that these things don’t happen. That is because** – power**.** No, we’re not moving into a situation where people’s right to freedom of speech is under threat; rather we are moving towards an even more dangerous situation where people champion the ‘right’ of freedom of speech above the responsibilities associated with it. **Equality legislation does not equal redistribution of power**. If you’re serious about equality, or about ending oppression, then you have to recognise that, and you need to move power from those who have traditionally enjoyed it to those who find it lacking. It’s easy for legislators to change the law to nominally ‘achieve’ equality because it does not involve them having to give power away. Equality for all before the law = bingo, equality achieved. **And it’s the same for freedom of speech**, or is it? **The premise is that if you have freedom of speech for everyone, that means that you can hear hateful views that seek to oppress others because it gives you the opportunity to take them down in public and expose them for what they are**, etcetera, etcetera. Yes, we’ve heard it all before – it’s a very well worn argument. It’s also, if you’ll forgive the vernacular, an absolute load of guff. **To hear the views of powerful oppressors and to be able to neutralise them suggests that everyone has a level playing field to proceed from in order to achieve that.** I’m going to show my age but, to quote John Cage from Ally McBeal, ‘say it with me – please…’ Freedom of speech is no longer about rights; it’s about power. **Just as with equality, we have legal equality but not real equality due to the maintenance of traditional structures of power, so too with freedom of speech we have an unequal distribution of power, and it’s certainly not in the favour of those who seek to no-platform.** **If you need proof of this, just take a look at those who generally end up being no-platformed. The process does not restrict their freedom of speech in any way whatsoever, because they have any number of other ways in which they can express their views. That’s because their exercise of the right to freedom of speech comes from a position of power.** Put simply, being able to shut down the attempts of oppressed groups to fight your rhetoric is the new marker of power, and feeling ‘oppressed’ because people are telling you they don’t want to give you a forum for your views is the new white cis disease. **What people really mean when they refer to their freedom of speech is their position of power. By saying that we don’t want to hear people, we’re threatening their power, not their civil rights. This is what alarms the white cis lobby that sees the rest of us as the enemy to freedom of expression. This is unsurprising when you consider what they have to lose.** But what this also exposes is some of the fractures within the LGBTQ+ community itself. In terms of serious commentary, I see [white cis gay men](https://thequeerness.com/2015/10/14/on-the-selfishness-of-the-white-cis-gay-male/) getting quite angry about freedom of speech, more so than about the struggles of other sections of the community to which we all allegedly belong. Being able to shut down the attempts of oppressed groups to fight your rhetoric is the new marker of power, and feeling ‘oppressed’ because people are telling you they don’t want to give you a forum for your views in the new white cis disease. The problem is that, just like their cis heterosexual counterparts, many of these men simply don’t understand serious oppression. It’ll occasionally rear its ugly head, but generally they don’t need to think about oppression as regularly as many of their counterparts because they lead privileged lives. White cis gays knows where the power lies, hence their support of the power structure that lies behind freedom of speech. There’s more in it for them to support the position of white cis heterosexual liberals in maintaining a system that upholds the ‘rights’ of freedom of expression over the responsibility to not use it to treat people like dirt; as with anything wrong in our society, it’s easier to put yourself on the side of the status quo than it is to fight for change. By saying that we don’t want to hear people, we’re threatening their power, not their civil rights. **If all these people put as much energy into ending oppression as they did into protecting their right to talk trash about people with impunity then they probably could have saved the world ten times over.** Instead, it’s more important to make sure that we hear the voices of oppressed white cis people.

#### Even if free speech is important, the 1AC has got to be able to do better than to base our liberation in a document that legitimized slave-owning and supports the neocolonial project. The constitutional protection behind free speech is a fleeting safeguard that only exists to protect that which does not actually threaten the system.

Gelderloos and Lincoln 05 [Peter, and Patrick. World Behind Bars: The Expansion of the American Prison Sell. Harrisonburg, Virginia: Signalfire Press, 2005.

**We are taught from grade school** and even earlier **that** we live in a free country, so it may clash with most people’s perceptions of reality to say that a major role of the police and the prison system is to repress dissent. **The First Amendment guarantees us “free speech**,” **though** admittedly there are also **certain types of speech** that **are not free**. For example, Patrick and I were not free to protest on Fort Benning Army Base. **The common explanation** (though it proved false during cross-examination in my trial) **is that such a protest creates a “security risk,”** but **this explanation** is a distraction. It **obscures** the major point, which everyone should be able to agree on, **that allowing free speech is not the government’s first priority**. In the case of Patrick and myself, and many other people, “**security” is prioritized over free speech**. This is not controversial: to get around the mystifications surrounding our government, we need first to admit that freedom is not the top priority. **In many a high school government class, students learn** other exceptions to free speech. A common one is known as “Clear and Present Danger.” Generally, the teacher will explain that **we are not free to yell fire in a crowded theater**, because doing so poses a clear and present danger to people. Curiously, **the actual case that established this** principle is almost never explained to the students. The analogy of yelling fire in the theater **is the same one** used by Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, when he was **justifying** the actions of **the government in locking up several people for passing out pamphlets against the draft during World War I. Holmes said the government has a right to prevent people from committing actions that posed a clear and present danger of bringing about those substantive evils that the government has a responsibility to prevent. In this case, keeping out of a bloody war that did not at all concern or threaten the United States was a substantive “evil,” and handing out pamphlets saying that the military draft amounted to involuntary servitude posed a clear and present danger of bringing about peace. So, in the government’s own logic, the police had the right to lock people up for passing out a pamphlet that contradicted the government’s chosen priorities. What other government priorities are we not allowed to speak out against?** If participation in World War I (which helped the US grow in economic and political stature and become a world power, but certainly wasn’t required for the survival of the state) was a government priority that justified repressing dissent, then we can certainly expect that preserving and increasing elite power will also be a government priority as well. Not giving the Indians back their land, not paying back black people for everything that was stolen from them during their enslavement, perpetuating US imperialism and corporate exploitation throughout the world; all of these injustices are foundations for the US power structure. If all you want is a new law to prohibit smoking in certain public places, or require that guns be sold with safety locks, you’re in luck. It won’t be a fair fight: corporations and wealthy individuals that prefer the status quo will have an enormous advantage over you, with better access to the political system, but with enough work and money you might succeed. Your free speech and your political activity will be respected. But if you want something more than that, if you want a change that challenges the foundations of state power, you will run into some walls you may not have noticed before. US history is full of examples of social movements violently repressed by the government. Native American resistance was subjected to genocide. — Black slaves were brutalized and terrorized to prevent them from revolting. Striking workers were massacred, in Chicago, at Homestead, at Ludlow, and dozens of other places. Police and vigilantes organized by bosses destroyed radical unions through beatings, mass arrest, false imprisonment, execution, and lynching. The anarchist movement was destroyed with mass arrests and deportations. The government used its new air force after World War I to bomb rebellious coal miners in Appalachia. Police infiltrators neutralized the Communist Party before World War II. The Civil Rights movement was spied on and brutalized. FBI informants joined chapters of the Ku Klux Klan and helped them carry out attacks and killings against black organizers. State forces killed over 60 American Indian Movement supporters on Pine Ridge reservation, where the group was trying to defend traditional rights. J. Edgar Hoover developed a sophisticated program of repression known as COINTELPRO, which was used against the black liberation movement, the anti-war movement, and others. We only know of the existence of that program because people stole files from an FBI office in Pennsylvania, and the Senate was forced to acknowledge the program in the Church Committee hearings. Consider this one statement from an FBI internal memo in 1968: “The [black] youth and moderates must be made to understand that if they succumb to revolutionary teaching, they will be dead revolutionaries.” This statement came at a time when dozens of black revolutionaries were dying at the hands of police and police informants, or being framed and imprisoned. This history of repression continues into the present day. Multiple people have been arrested for wearing political t-shirts or holding protest signs at events where President Bush was speaking. **Police have beaten and arrested anarchists, anti-war protesters, and especially politically active people of color and** **queer or transgender people at multiple protests every year this decade**. The FBI is targeting radical environmentalists as part of the War on Terror. In Harrisonburg a few years ago, the cops shut down an anarchist community center we set up, using regulations that are never enforced against businesses in town. Just this year, the police spied on the Virginia Anarchist Gathering that was hosted here, and we learned from people contacted in the investigation that the police were working on behalf of Homeland Security. We have yet to know the extent of repression happening right now, because it is happening in secret, but government documents obtained by the ACLU and other groups consistently show the FBI and police spying on and repressing activists. **Police and prisons play a major role in the repression of dissent.** Our government claims not to have any political prisoners, but like any dictatorship the US government insists on calling political prisoners “criminals.” **Where political activity is not criminalized outright, effective political organizers are framed and imprisoned, or police brutalize and spy on activists when the media is not paying attention.** Ralph Aron, former Warden of Marion Federal Penitentiary, said: “The purpose of the Marion Control Unit is to control revolutionary attitudes in the prison system and in the society at large” (From “In the Spirit of Fred Hampton and Mark Clark: Carry On the Tradition of Resistance,” published in Notes From A New Afrikan POW Journal, Book Seven, 1980). It is impossible to give a detailed history of government repression here, but if you want to find it the information is out there. If you are not aware of it already, you will discover government repression once you step out of line, especially if you are trying to change the system. In my experience, the most freedom of speech I ever had was in the Security Housing Unit, in federal prison. For the first time in my life, I could say whatever I wanted, and not have to worry about punishment from parents, teachers, bosses, or cops. That’s because my words were hot air, and the walls were solid concrete. **What makes us free is not speech and opinions. What makes us free is power, and we are only allowed to speak freely when our speech does not pose a threat, does not present the clear and present danger, of changing who holds power in this society. We are free to talk about clothing and TV shows, we are free to talk about voting for this politician or to tell jokes about politician, we are free to petition for bald eagles or two hour work days or to yell out that it’s all a big conspiracy, or to write careful analyses of what’s wrong with the government in scholarly journals. We are not free to tear these walls down. But we must find the power to do so, and use it.**

#### As Eric Stanley himself states, “Free Speech is too expensive”. This faustian bargain by which the eradication of queerness is the price for free speech results in overkill. Overkill is ontologically different from other types of violence-it’s more than an attempt to do violence unto a body, it’s an attempt to do violence unto all queer bodies. Don’t let them weigh case-Their impact calculus will never understand what it means to do violence to that which is nothing.

Stanley 11 (Eric, Sad Gay “Near Life, Queer Death Overkill and Ontological Capture,” Social Text 107 s Vol. 29, No. 2 s Summer 2011) AV//JB

Overkill is a term used to indicate such excessive violence that it pushes a body beyond death. Overkill is often determined by the postmortem removal of body parts, as with the partial decapitation in the case of Lauryn Paige and the dissection of Rashawn Brazell. The temporality of violence, the biological time when the heart stops pushing and pulling blood, yet the killing is not finished, suggests the aim is not simply the end of a specific life, but the ending of all queer life. This is the time of queer death, when the utility of violence gives way to the pleasure in the other’s mortality. If queer**s**, along with others, approximate nothing, then the task of ending, of killing, that which is nothing must go beyond normative times of life and death. In other words, if Lauryn was dead after the first few stab wounds to the throat, then what do the remaining fifty wounds signify? The legal theory that is offered to nullify the practice of overkill often functions under the name of the trans- or gay-panic defense. Both of these defense strategies argue that the murderer became so enraged after the “discovery” of either genitalia or someone’s sexuality they were forced to protect themselves from the threat of queerness. Estanislao Martinez of Fresno, California, used the trans-panic defense and received a four-year prison sentence after admittedly stabbing J. Robles, a Latina transwoman, at least twenty times with a pair of scissors. Importantly, this defense is often used, as in the cases of Robles and Paige, after the murderer has engaged in some kind of sex with the victim. The logic of the trans-panic defense as an explanation for overkill, in its gory semiotics, offers us a way of understanding queers as the nothing of Mbembe’s query. Overkill names the technologies necessary to do away with that which is already gone. Queers then are the specters of life whose threat is so unimaginable that one is “forced,” not simply to murder, but to push them backward out of time, out of History, and into that which comes before. 27 In thinking the overkill of Paige and Brazell, I return to Mbembe’s query, “But what does it mean to do violence to what is nothing?”28 This question in its elegant brutality repeats with each case I offer. By resituating this question in the positive, the “something” that is more often than not translated as the human is made to appear. Of interest here, the category of the human assumes generality, yet can only be activated through the specificity of historical and politically located intersection. To this end, the human, the “something” of this query, within the context of the liberal democracy, names rights-bearing subjects, or those who can stand as subjects before the law. The human, then, makes the nothing not only possible but necessary. Following this logic, the work of death, of the death that is already nothing, not quite human, binds the categorical (mis)recognition of humanity. The human, then, resides in the space of life and under the domain of rights, whereas the queer inhabits the place of compromised personhood and the zone of death. As perpetual and axiomatic threat to the human, the queer is the negated double of the subject of liberal democracy. Understanding the nothing as the unavoidable shadow of the human serves to counter the arguments that suggest overkill and antiqueer violence at large are a pathological break and that the severe nature of these killings signals something extreme. In contrast, overkill is precisely not outside of, but is that which constitutes liberal democracy as such. Overkill then is the proper expression to the riddle of the queer nothingness. Put another way, the spectacular material-semiotics of overkill should not be read as (only) individual pathology; these vicious acts must indict the very social worlds of which they are ambassadors. Overkill is what it means, what it must mean, to do violence to what is nothing.

#### Our alternative is Queer Nihilism-A continuous struggle of negativity against every possible form of civil society. Ours is a recognition that there is no space for the queer within the symbolic order and never will be and that the only life worth living is one of inevitable struggle in which we ascribe ourselves to the death drive. There is no perm-we are an embrace of the inherent destruction of society, the 1AC embraces it in some form.

Baedan 12 ["Baedan." The Anarchist Library. N.p., Summer 2012. Web. 02 Nov. 2016.]

**Leftist notions of reform, progress, tolerance, and social justice always come up against the harsh reality that any progressive development can only mean a more sophisticated system of misery and exploitation; that tolerance means nothing; that justice is an impossibility**. **Activists**, progressive and revolutionary alike, **will always respond to our critique** of the social order **with a demand that we articulate some sort of alternative. Let us say once and for all that we have none to offer. Faced with the system’s seamless integration of all positive projects into itself, we can’t afford to affirm or posit any more alternatives for it to consume. Rather we must realize that our task is infinite, not because we have so much to build but because we have an entire world to destroy. Our daily life is so saturated and structured by capital that it is impossible to imagine a life worth living, except one of revolt. We understand destruction to be necessary, and we desire it in abundance. We have nothing to gain through shame or lack of confidence in these desires. There cannot be freedom in the shadow of prisons, there cannot be human community in the context of commodities, there cannot be self-determination under the reign of a state. This world—the police and armies that defend it, the institutions that constitute it, the architecture that gives it shape, the subjectivities that populate it, the apparatuses that administer its function, the schools that inscribe its ideology, the activism that franticly responds to its crises, the arteries of its circulation and flows, the commodities that define life within it, the communication networks that proliferate it, the information technology that surveils and records it—must be annihilated in every instance, all at once.** To shy away from this task, to assure our enemies of our good intentions, is the most crass dishonesty. **Anarchy, as with queerness, is most powerful in its negative form. Positive conceptions of these**, when they are not simply a quiet acquiescence in the face of a sophisticated and evolving totality of domination, **are hopelessly trapped in combat with the details of this totality on its own terms**.

### Gender 1NC

#### The 1AC assumes that debate happens regardless of the subject position-for the trans subject debates do not happen with them but on them. This process destroys the ethos of the trans subject-they are seen as liars and pathologized by society which destroys the possibility for counterspeech.

Stone 1994 (Sandy, artist, “The Empire Strikes Back: A Posttranssexual Manifesto,” in Camera Obscura)

“Making” history, whether autobiographic, academic, or clinical, is partly a struggle to ground an account in some natural inevitability. Bodies are screens on which we see projected the momentary settlements that emerge from ongoing struggles over beliefs and practices within the academic and medical communities. These struggles play themselves out in arenas far removed from the body. Each is an attempt to gain a high ground that is profoundly moral in character, to make an authoritative and final explanation for the way things are and consequently for the way they must continue to be. In other words, each of these accounts is culture speaking with the voice of an individual. The people who have no voice in this theorizing are [trans people] the transsexuals [trans people] themselves. As with men theorizing about women from the beginning of time, theorists of gender have seen [trans people] transsexuals as possessing something less than agency. As with genetic women, transsexuals [trans people] are infantilized, considered too illogical or irresponsible to achieve true subjectivity, or clinically erased by diagnostic criteria; or else, as constructed by some radical feminist theorists, as robots of an insidious and menacing patriarchy, an alien army designed and constructed to infiltrate, pervert, and destroy “true” women. In this construction as well, the transsexuals [trans people] have been resolutely complicit by failing to develop an effective counterdiscourse. Here on the gender borders at the close of the twentieth century, with the faltering of phallocratic hegemony and the bumptious appearance of heteroglossic origin accounts, we find the epistemologies of white male medical practice, the rage of radical feminist theories, and the chaos of lived gendered experience meeting on the battlefield of the [trans] transsexual body: a hotly contested site of cultural inscription, a meaning machine for the production of ideal type. Representation at its most magical, the [trans] transsexual body is perfected memory, inscribed with the “true” story of Adam and Eve as the ontological account of irreducible difference, an essential biography that is part of nature. A story that culture tells itself, the transsexual body is a tactile politics of reproduction constituted through textual violence. The clinic is a technology of inscription. Given this circumstance in which a minority discourse comes to ground in the physical, a counterdiscourse is critical. But it is difficult to generate a counterdiscourse if one is programmed to disappear. The highest purpose of the transsexual is to erase his/herself, to fade into the “normal” population as soon as possible. Part of this process is known as constructing a plausible history-learning to lie effectively about one’s past. What is gained is acceptability in society. What is lost is the ability to authentically represent the complexities and ambiguities of lived experience, and thereby is lost that aspect of “nature” that Donna Haraway theorizes as Coyote-the Native American spirit animal who represents the power of continual transformation that is the heart of engaged life. Instead, authentic experience is replaced by a particular kind of story, one that supports the old constructed positions. This is expensive, and profoundly disempowering. Whether desiring to do so or not, transsexuals [trans people] do not grow up in the same ways as “GGs,” or genetic “naturals.”~~ Transsexuals [trans people] do not possess the same history as genetic “naturals,” and do not share common oppression, prior to gender reassignment. I am not suggesting a shared discourse. I am suggesting that in the transsexual’s erased [trans] history we can find a story disruptive to the accepted discourses of gender, that originates from within the gender minority itself and that can make common cause with other oppositional discourses. But the [trans body] transsexual currently occupies a position that is nowhere, that is outside the binary oppositions of gendered discourse. For a transsexual, as a transsexual, **to generate a true, effective, and representational counterdiscourse is to speak from outside the boundaries of gender, beyond the constructed oppositional nodes that have been defined as the only positions from which discourse is possible. How, then, can the [transgender subject]** transsexual **speak?** If the transsexual were to speak, what would s/he say?

#### The impact is a violent gendered domestication. Colonialism entrapped subjects within a racialized gender binary that laid the groundwork for future violence.

Baedan 14 ["Against the Gendered Nightmare: Fragments on Domestication," https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/baedan-against-the-gendered-nightmare]

**Gender is domestication**. The two supposedly distinct phenomena appear as mutually constituting because they are one and the same phenomenon. Earlier we said that **domestication is the capture of living things by something non-living. It is also the process where capture is internalized by living beings who are then shaped into pre-determined roles. The non-living thing is immortal and continues long after its captives are dead, and that it is constantly accumulating new lives in order to reproduce itself. Gender is precisely this non-living institution which tears individuals away from themselves and reconstitutes them as a pre-determined role. Gender would be an empty husk if it wasn’t for its constant capture of new bodies; bodies which in turn give it life. Isn’t the first incursion of Civilization into the life of a wild newborn always to proclaim its gender?** It is the first separation which gives rise to all others. **Gender is the cipher through which Leviathan categorizes and understands each and every one of the beings trapped in its entrails. A whole destiny of experience is inscribed on our bodies from it.** We should also remember that we previous identified a theme where domesticated people invoke the image of those they are not and never were to justify their own machinations and violence. In gender, we see all the ways that the gender binary is naturalized as sex and projected into pre-history as a way of explaining and rationalizing (essentializing) all of these experiences of violence. **We are told those assigned female are meant to be mothers, and therefore it is in their nature to endure pain, to be caretakers, to submit to external authority. Those assigned male are virile hunters and warriors, violence and rape are supposedly intrinsic to their nature. Homosexuals are aberrations in nature, and thus they are fated for exile in their short, brutal and diseased lives. Every mask of the natural is only ever a lie told by Leviathan to justify its own activity.** An understanding of gender as domestication is supported by the inquiries of a handful of anti-colonial theorists of gender such as María Lugones, Andrea Smith and Oyèrónkẹ́ Oyěwùmí. Smith, for example, horrifyingly illustrates the use of sexual violence as strategy of Leviathan’s conquest of the Americas.[[6]](https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/baedan-against-the-gendered-nightmare#fn6) More so, she argues that colonialism is itself structured by sexual violence. Lugones, as another example, argues that **gender itself is violently introduced by colonial civilization**.[[7]](https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/baedan-against-the-gendered-nightmare#fn7) She says **it is consistently and contemporarily used to destroy peoples, cosmologies and communities in order to form the building ground of the ‘civilized West.’** She argues that **the colonial system produces different racialized genders, but more importantly institutes gender itself as a way of organizing relations, knowledges and cosmic understanding.** This is useful because it refuses a universal or natural understanding of Patriarchy that lacks a critique of racial and heteronormative colonialism. Instead, her argument helps us to describe the gender as something that spreads, consumes and destroys. She describes this process as the Colonial/Modern Gender System. This system entails the naturalization of the sexual binary, the demonization of a racial and hermaphroditic other, and the violent eradication of everything outside civilization: third genders, homosexuality, gynocentric knowledges and non-gendered existence, etc. Oyèrónkẹ́ Oyěwùmí in The Invention of Women describes how gender was not an organizing principle in Yoruba society prior to colonization. She says that patriarchy only emerges when Yoruba society is “translated into english to fit the western pattern of body reasoning.” She locates the dominance of civilization’s gender system in its documentation and interpretation of the world. “Researchers always find gender when they look for it.” **Within colonialism, new subject categories were created by western Civilization and were racialized and engendered as the foundation of the new colonial state. This creation process is composed of several operations: the introduction and entrenchment of gender roles, the imposition of Male gods, the formation of Patriarchal colonial government, the displacement of people from their traditional means of subsistence and the violent institution of the Family. These operations serve as a revision which recasts and genders tribal life and spirituality.** This engendering does more than create the victimized category of women, but also constructs men as collaborators in domestication. **Lugones cites the British strategy of bringing indigenous men to English schools where they would be instructed in the ways of civilized gender. These men would work within the colonial state to deprive women of their previous power to declare war, bear arms and determine their own relationships. She also cites the Spanish strategy of criminalizing sodomy among colonized populations, intertwining it with racialized hatred of the Moors and other ‘primitive’ people.** These theorists employ stories and examples of ‘third genders’ not as a literal description of a three gendered system, but instead as a place holder for the infinite range of bodily possibility which exists outside the colonial system. They argue that domestication has to be imposed as gender in order to disintegrate all the communal and free relationships, rituals and overlapping means of survival. **And as the civilized ideal of racial gender is naturalized, everything outside of itself is fair game for capture, domination and reshaping.** Colonialism itself is often described through the racial and sexual metaphor of the white male explorer uncovering and pillaging the dark female continents, forcing her to submit and planting the seed of civilization. From this perspective**, we can recognize all the incidents of gendered and racial violence in our lives as repetitions of this first capture.** Sex work, abusive relationships, body dysmorphia, marriage, sexual abuse, familial constraint, date rape, gang rape, queer bashing, psychiatry, electroshock therapy, eating disorders, domestic labor, unwanted pregnancy, fetishization, emotional labor, street harassment, pornography: each instance is a moment where we are torn from ourselves, taken by another, captured and determined as a brutal repetition of the primary rupture which denied us a life lived by and for ourselves. In this schema, **the assimilation and medicalization of queer and transgendered people can be understood as a re-capture of rebellious bodies. Police murder and racist vigilantism can likewise be understood as functions of this capture. It is worth noting here that to understand gender as domestication is crucially different from understanding patriarchy as a consequence of domestication, in that the former is a break from the trap of essentialism**. None of the above is limited to one subject of the gendered world. Rape, for example, is not solely the experience of women (as is often claimed by various regurgitations of second wave feminism), but is a disgustingly widespread experience among people of all genders. The assertion that any form of gender violence is the exclusive property of one category of people would be laughable if it weren’t for the litany of horrors which serve to disprove it. More sinisterly, these type of essentialist assertions obscure and shame those experience an entire range of very real experiences of gender violence. **Situating gender as domestication is a way to understand gender violence outside of an essentialist and white framework. Without this understanding, all theories which attribute some natural dimension to sex/gender** (from eco-feminist to Marxist feminist) **are structurally unable to account for the violence, capture, and exclusion experienced by anyone who deviates from the gender binary or the heterosexual matrix. These ideologies will expand to pay lip-service to queer and transpeople, but they never alter the structure of their theory. This amounts to little more than the liberal politics of inclusion.** If, however, we understand gender as something which captures us, rather than something natural to us (or extracted from our biological existence), we can begin to analyze all the methods of domination experienced by queer or transgender people. **Brutality and exclusion come to be recognized as the policing methods by which individuals remain captured; assimilation and exploitation represent a more sophisticated capture.** From here I can see the line which binds together the boys who called me faggot as a teenager and the gay men who would pay me for sex a few years later. Everything about the refusal of gender follows from this. The criticism of identity, assimilation, medicalization or any technique of the self becomes meaningful once it is placed in this continuum.

#### The alternative is an abolitionist ethic of gender self-determination: drawing together multiple strands of anti-colonial, black, trans, queer and anti-capitalist critique, our refusal to rely on the state to defend, define and liberate us allows for the critical subversions of normativity that deflect everyday pain onto queer and trans bodies.

Stanley 2014 (Eric, "Gender Self-Determination" in TSQ: Trans Studies Quarterly, Vol. 1-2, pp 89-92)

Gender self-determination is a collective praxis against the brutal pragmatism of the present, the liquidation of the past, and the austerity of the future. That is to say, it indexes a horizon of possibility already here, which struggles to make freedom flourish through a radical trans politics. Not only a defensive posture, it builds in the name of the undercommons a world beyond the world, lived as a dream of the good life.1 Within at least the US context, the normalizing force of mainstream trans politics, under the cover of equality, operates by consolidation and exile. Or put another way, through its fetishistic attachment to the law and its vicissitudes, mainstream trans politics argues for inclusion in the same formations of death that have already claimed so many. This collusion can be seen in the lobbying for the addition of ‘‘gender identity’’ to federal hate crimes enhancements. While the quotidian violence many trans people face—in particular trans women of color—is the material of daily life, this push for the expansion of the prison-industrial complex through hate crimes legislation proliferates violence under the name of safety. Legislative and semilegislative apparatuses from the United Nations and NGOs to local governance have begun to include similar language around ‘‘gender equity.’’ Champions of such moves might cite the Yogyakarta Principles (2007), which are the findings of a human rights commission convened to foreground ‘‘Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity’’ globally, or such recent decisions as that of the Australian government to add a third gender option of ‘‘X’’ to their passports as signs of progress. However, an ethic of gender self-determination helps us to resist reading these biopolitical shifts as victories. Here the state and its interlocutors, including at times trans studies, work to translate and in turn confine the excesses of gendered life into managed categories at the very moment of radical possibility.2 To begin with the ‘‘self’’ in the wake of neoliberalism might seem a dangerous place to turn a phrase, especially one that is suggested to offer such radical potentiality—and perhaps it is. After all, the ‘‘self ’’ in our contemporary moment points most easily toward the fiction of the fully possessed rights-bearing subject of Western modernity, the foil of the undercommons. However, here it is not the individual but a collective self, an ontological position always in relation to others and dialectically forged in otherness, that is animated. The negation of this collective self, as relational and nonmimetic, is the alibi for contemporary rights discourse, which argues that discrete legal judgments will necessarily produce progressive change. Rather than believe that this is an oversight of the state form, critics of human rights discourse remind us that this substitution is a precondition of the state’s continued power. Antagonistic to such practices of constriction and universality, gender self-determination is affectively connected to the practices and theories of self-determination embodied by various and ongoing anticolonial, Black Power, and antiprison movements. For Frantz Fanon and many others, the violence of colonialism and antiblackness are so totalizing that ontology itself collapses; thus the claiming of a self fractures the everydayness of colonial domination. The Black Panther Party for Self Defense echoed a similar perspective in their 1966 Ten Point Plan. Self-determination, for the Panthers and for many others, is the potentiality of what gets called freedom. Connecting these histories, ‘‘gender self-determination is queer liberation is prison abolition’’ was articulated by the gender and queer liberation caucus of CR10, Critical Resistance’s tenth anniversary conference in 2008 (The CR10 Publications Collective, 2008: 7). To center radical black, anticolonial, and prison abolitionist traditions is to already be inside trans politics.3 From STAR’s (Street Transvestite Action Revolutionaries) alliance with the Young Lords in New York City and the recent organizing against US drone attacks led by trans women in Sukkur, Pakistan, to Miss Major’s words that anoint this essay, these forms of gender self-determination, even if left unnamed, argue that national liberation and the overthrow of colonial and carceral rule must be grown together with gender liberation (see Littauer 2012). Gender self-determination opens up space for multiple embodiments and their expressions by collectivizing the struggle against both interpersonal and state violence. Further, it pushes us away from building a trans politics on the fulcrum of realness (gender normative, trans, or otherwise) while also responding to the different degrees of harm people are forced to inhabit. As a nonprescriptive politics, its contours cannot always be known in advance—it is made and remade in the process of its actualization, in the time of resistance and in the place of pleasure. Becoming, then, as Gilles Deleuze might have it—or more importantly, as Miss Major lives it (Stanley and Smith 2011)—is the moment of gender selfdetermination: becoming liberated as we speak.